

FAX

TO: Examiner Fatima Ast	FROM: Mike Scaturro
FAX: 571 273 7217	PAGES To follow: 1
RE: Ser. No. 10/029,921	DATE: April 19, 2005

--- MESSAGE ---

Dear Examiner Ast –

Pursuant to your request, I am providing an outline of the issues I would like to discuss with you during a telcon regarding the above matter.

First, In the Office Action you reject independent Claim 1 over Emens (102). In par. 5 you state that Emens discloses a method for “preventing access” to an “electronic media object”. You further state that preventing a user from accessing said electronic media object is identified as filtering and predefined inappropriate content items are identified as a rating repository. Our claim 1 states:

1. A method for preventing access to an electronic media object comprising:
Analyzing at least one of audio and image information associated with said electronic media object; and
Preventing a user from accessing said electronic media object if said analyzing step determines that said electronic media object contains one or more predefined inappropriate content items.

You further state that Emens defines an electronic media object as an HTML document, an audio file or an image file.

I would like to discuss the distinction between filtering content items from a media object, as taught in Emens and “preventing a user from accessing the media object” in its entirety, as taught in Claim 1. They are, in my opinion, two clearly separate and distinct things. Emens is merely teaching an editing (filtering) process while the Applicants teach wholesale access prevention of the file in its entirety (not just certain words).

With regard to claims 2 and 3, I would like to discuss a further distinction regarding the user profile. Applicants teach a user profile 200, a stop word database 300 and an

audio/visual content evaluation process 400. The stop word database 300 is analogous to what is taught in the two cited references in the rejection of claims 2 and 3. What is not taught is the user profile 200 which indicates whether each user can access certain categories of content. In other words, the category is the discriminator used to prevent or allow access to the entire media object. By contrast, Table 7 of Cragun establishes a table 7 that uses particular words as the discriminators for preventing access to only those words. While the user establishes a category field associated with the offensive word, the category is not used as the discriminator, but only as ancillary descriptive data defining a category for each offensive word.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss my concerns. I look forward to speaking with you.

Mike Scaturro
adcourt@optonline.com
516 414 2007
Reg. No. 51,356